

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

The Scottsdale Collection 9-ZN-2020 1-II-2020

<u>Number</u>	<u>City of Scottsdale Comments</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1	To promote transparency, please ensure Goal, Policy and Guidelines references are correct in the Development Plan. Staff has identified enumeration discrepancies (such as mis-numbering of Old Town Urban Design & Architectural Guidelines). Additionally, please add page numbering to the Development Plan (DP) for reference.	Guideline references have been renumbered and page numbers have been added to the entire Development Plan book.

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 2 The 2001 General Plan Character & Design Element (Goal 1) and Neighborhoods Element (Goal 4, bullet 3 and Goal 5) note that new development should be contextually compatible with the established areas in the community. Similarly, the OTSCAP (Character & Design Chapter, Goals CD 1 and CD 9) places importance on the character created by new building design, and how it may contextually respond to adjacent development while still achieving architectural interest. Furthermore, the Old Town Scottsdale Urban Design & Architectural Guidelines (OTSUDAG) (Primary Guidelines 12 and 13) encourages building design that both complements the existing development context and reduces apparent building size and mass. The narrative states that this proposal “will attempt to design buildings that reduce the presence of size and mass, creating spaces that blend in with the planned context of the site” (Page 138). It appears the City Center and Mint renderings break up building mass both architecturally and through use of building materials; however, in review of the proposed development standards and site sections (Pages 80-101 of the DP), future allowable building heights, setbacks and stepbacks that could occur on the various parcels have the potential, based on sought entitlements, to result in massive, monolithic structures; taking into consideration the context area. With the next submittal, please address the following:

Based on direction from meetings with planning, an open space or plaza requirement has been added to each parcel to ensure that the massing shown in this submittal will closely reflect future submittals.

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

2-A B Parcels: Please consider setbacks along the Camelback Road frontage that incline at a ratio of 1:1 beginning 30 feet above the minimum setback from the public street to 45 feet in height, and 2:1 thereafter; rather than the proposed 2:1 stepback beginning at 45 feet. This would generally allow for the massing portrayed on the renderings, ensure future flexibility for massing and ensure building envelopes and massing along Camelback Road have a similar look and street presence to previous approvals, i.e. DC Hotel (2-ZN-2018). See graphic below.

The current stepback plane cannot be revised because it currently allows for necessary above grade parking floor plates. An open space requirement has been added to this parcel to ensure upper level stepbacks and variation in massing. Design Guidelines have also added a section for enhanced building and streetscape design on the public street perimeter areas, further enhancing standards for this parcel.

2-B C Parcels: Please consider incorporating a stepback plane. As submitted, the C Parcels allow for buildings that provide minimal vertical articulation, which is discouraged by the OTSUDAG (Guidelines 13 & 14). The OTSUDAG discussed the importance of reducing apparent mass of high-rise buildings in Old Town. Provide discussion and further detail as to how the C Parcels will distinguish base, middle and top, including the incorporation of features such as extended floorplates, architecturally integrated functional balconies (not “tacked on”), solar shade devices, shifts in the horizontal wall plane and details that project and/or recess.

Hotel typology prohibits stepbacks. Base-middle-top design in outlined in design guidelines. Open space requirement at ground level or elevated podium added to parcel A, B, and C Conceptual Site Features in Development plan book. Also added to open space plan and DRB will mandate adherence.

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 2-C D Parcels: Please consider a minimum 15-foot setback to ensure that, when adjacent to a 60-foot high building, a meaningful street presence, other than just a sidewalk, is provided. For example, the setback could include base plantings to provide space between the building and the sidewalk, softening the impact between building height and human-scale development. **The current head-in parking alignment and small size of the parcel warrants retaining a 10' setback to ensure a meaningful and leasable building depth can be constructed on the property.**

-
- 2-D Please provide cross-section exhibits that detail the relationship of the Mint site proposed development standards and the existing residential neighborhoods north of Camelback Road. **Sections in the booklet have been revised to show the residential neighborhood to the north. See DP pages 93-95.**

-
- 3 3. The General Plan Land Use Element (Goal 5, bullet 2), Character & Design Element (Goal 6), Economic Vitality Element (Goal 5, bullet 6, Neighborhoods Element (Goal 4, bullet 7) and the Community Mobility Element (Goal 11, bullet 10) encourage pedestrian oriented development with meaningful landscaping. Additionally, the OTSCAP (Policies CD 1.5, CD 3.2, CD 4.1, CD 4.3, Goals CD 6 and CD 7, and Goals M 1 and M 2) states the importance of the pedestrian environment and how interaction with open spaces and landscaping can enhance the pedestrian experience. With the next submittal please address the following:
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 3-A •Throughout the DP, there is a suggestion that overall development will provide a continuous, character-driven pedestrian and open space realm; however, in reviewing the individual parcels within the DP, it does not appear that a continuous, linear environment can be realized, as most of the parcels are not contiguous to one another. As such, it is not clear if the proposal will improve the pedestrian environment and open space areas outside of parcels not part of this DP. Several exhibits in the DP, such as the Pedestrian Plan (Page 158), Conceptual Streetscape Master Plan and the Conceptual Street Tree Inventory & Supplementation Plan (Page 205) appear to note improvements outside of the DP area. If there are offsite improvements that accomplish this, please confirm; as the improvements that would be accomplished throughout this context area would achieve the continuous, character-driven pedestrian and open space realm envisioned throughout the DP. Provide additional narrative responses within the DP and or/exhibits that detail how this pedestrian and open space real will be achieved.
- Areas outside of parcel frontage will have design intent that COS will advise how to improve ROW in front of noninclusive parcels. The DP is meant to act as a design directive for all parcels to achieve a cohesive district. District standards with suggested plantings, lighting, furniture and paving are included in the landscape design guidelines starting on page 208.**
-
- 3-B • Throughout the DP, it is reiterated that the Scottsdale Collective “will provide a range of public and private open spaces”; however, in reviewing the Open Space Plan (Page A115) it appears that the only meaningful open space is provided within the City Center site/ Please provide further narrative discussion in the DP and detail related to other open space areas that will be provided with this proposal.
- Open space requirements in the DP have been revised to show open space calculations and additional requirements per parcel - See Page 81, 91, and 100.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| 3-C | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please provide further detail to the Pedestrian Connection exhibit (Page 158) that notes existing and proposed sidewalk widths, which street frontages will provide landscape-separated sidewalks, illustrates how the 300-foot pedestrian grid correlates with potential/existing pedestrian linkages and indicates areas of public, private and/or semi-private pedestrian access to inform a hierarchy and network of pedestrian paths, connections and circulation within this area of Old Town. Provide discussion and/or detail to the exhibit as to how pedestrian activity occurs on each specific site within the DP (grade, canal and street level). | <p>Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation plan sheets beginning on page 165 have been modified to indicated new pedestrian links and sidewalk widths are called out within the linework Key/Legend on the page. Additionally, the new Enhanced Public Perimeter section of the design guidelines describes the pedestrian realm in narrative and section drawing format. See page 187-191.</p> |
| <hr/> | | |
| 3-D | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please consider providing both visual and physical pedestrian access that traverses through the City Center site from the southeast corner of Camelback Road and Scottsdale Road through the site to the Shoeman Land/Brown Avenue intersection. | <p>Stockdale/Triyar does not own the parcel at Shoeman/Brown which makes access to the intersection impossible. Lateral east/west access has been provided both on Camelback and internally to Brown.</p> |
| <hr/> | | |
| 3-E | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please provide further detail and purpose concerning hierarchy of information in the following exhibits:<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Conceptual Streetscape Master Plan (Pages 200-203): Define perimeter streets, Eclectic Quarter, Enhanced Streets, Alleyways, entry points, etc.➤ Conceptual Street Tree Inventory & Supplementation Plan (Page 205): Define City Center, Nightlife Quarter and Enhanced Streets. | <p>Additional definition for each exhibit including suggested tree species has been provided. Additional information on these typologies is in the revised landscape design guidelines on pages 228-230 and the additional section of Enhanced Public Perimeter on pages 187-189.</p> |
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- | | | |
|-------|---|--|
| 4 | <p>Please provide further detail related to the raised plaza proposed within the City Center site, as well as additional detail that might illustrate how it will facilitate circulation and movement to the canal bank, and if it will connect north across Camelback Road as a pedestrian bridge. Additionally, clarify if is the intent for this area to be a public or private space. Finally, provide detail related to the raised walkway/plaza space and whether or not it is intended to incorporate signage for the district or businesses.</p> | <p>This raised plaza feature is conceptual in nature and will be developed further as project moves forward. Project identity and signage is a possibility and would be handled under a separate submittal. Bridge connections across Scottsdale and Camelback are desireable if funding is available from the city. Area is intended to be a privately controlled plaza for the public to enjoy.</p> |
| <hr/> | | |
| 5 | <p>The General Plan (Character & Design Element, Goal 5, and Growth Areas Element, Goal 6) and the OTSCAP (Character & Design Chapter, Policies CD 5.5, CD 6.3 and CD 9.4, Mobility Chapter, Policy M 1.3, and the Arts & Culture Chapter) state the importance of Public Art as a cultural and place-making amenity. Throughout the DP, there are statements that note the importance of arts and culture, remarking that “Art will be a unifying theme for the Scottsdale Collective; incorporating, but not limited to, ground level experiences, shade elements, hardscape/seating and architectural design creating unique art encounters and visual experiences for residents and visitors” (Page 27); however, no description of Public Art installations, or where they may be located is provided. With the next submittal, please provide a Cultural Amenities Plan, noting planned and potential locations and scale of the features that will be provided. Public Art should be in locations that are publicly accessible and may include signature art pieces and/or at-grade pocket art parks. Finally, provide a more in-depth discussion concerning Public Art in the narrative and a Bonus Development Standard worksheet.</p> | <p>Cultural Amenities location plans have been added per parcel and can be found on pages 81, 91, and 100 in the DP book.</p> |
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| 6 | 6. The General Plan (Character & Design Element, Goal 4, bullet 13 and Goal 6, bullet 6) and the OTSCAP (Character & Design Chapter, Policy CD 7.2) emphasize the importance of mature trees and their placement within the built environment. Staff has noted that large trees have difficulty surviving when planted above below-grade garages. Street trees should be planted to accommodate proper maturation. With the next submittal, provide discussion in the DP related to street tree locations and planting methods relating to any future below-grade garages. | Landscaping, including tree plantings, will have to be implemented per the design guidelines and city standards no matter if it is on grade or on structure. Proper soil depth and planting conditions for optimum survival will be a priority for any planting over structure. |
|---|--|--|
-
- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 7 | The OTSCAP (Mobility Chapter, Goal M 4) states the importance of maintaining convenient, adequate and free public parking supply in the Old Town area. The provided Parking Master Plan (PMP) states that all parking for the Maya Hotel is to be provided off-site. With the next submittal, please: | PMP updated - see below. |
|---|---|---------------------------------|
-
- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| 7-A | Provide discussion in the DP that explicitly states how complete off-site parking will be handled and managed, i.e. parking management plan, valet service, drop-off areas, etc. | See PMP. Additional detail to be provide with future DRB submittals. |
|-----|--|---|
-
- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 7-B | Provide an updated PMP exhibit in the DP that clearly identifies private parking, public parking and flex-parking counts and their proposed locations. | Development sites are conceptual and will provide adequate parking for all uses designed per City Code. |
|-----|--|--|
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 7-C Update the Current Parking Typologies exhibit (Page 70) to align with this updated PMP, and to accurately note existing above- and below-grade parking structures in the context area. **Updated to align with PMP**

-
- 8 8. The Infill Incentive District (IID) is an application process by which flexible development standards are utilized to “encourage the private sector to attain a high level of quality development while also assisting in the provision of public amenities and benefits”. Although an IID is requested, it is unclear what flexibility is being requested that cannot be accomplished through the PBD request. With the next submittal, please clarify, and demonstrate what public benefits will occur as a result of the IID request. **The Infill Incentive (IID) is needed in order to amend development standards along Camelback Road (Mint Site) due to the site's adjacency to the Downtown Boundary. This is similar to the DC Hotel request.**

-
- 9 Lighting in Old Town is important as it can provide a safe and inviting environment (OTSCAP Character & Design Chapter, Goal CD 8). The proposal states “Streetlights will be designed and sited in a manner that strengthens the unique design of the project while maintaining safety for pedestrians”. With the next submittal, please provide clarity as to which city light poles will be reinstalled and/or relocated with the Street Lighting Plan. Notably, the City (a Tourism Department effort) is reviewing and updating lighting within this area of Old Town. As such, a new-style streetlight pole may be required and stipulated in this area. Please consult with both the City’s Tourism Department and Capital Project Management concerning light pole locations and types. **Lighting information provided with the zoning submittal is conceptual. Specific street lighting strategies will be further developed with future site plan submittal and DRB review. The team acknowledges that lighting layouts could be affected based on existing conditions. The City's Tourism and Capital Project Management will be consulted once lighting placement is determined.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- 10 Please ensure consistency across exhibits in the DP. For example, Page 89 notes the intersection of Saddlebag Trail and Indian Plaza as an Enhanced intersection, while Page 202 states it is a Pedestrian Node. Also define what descriptors such as “Enhanced Intersection” and “Pedestrian Node” mean, as there are many exhibits that identify such features, but there is nothing defined in the DP. **Consistency issues addressed with revised DP.**
-
- 11 Page 75: Site Context section states proposal consists of a total of 24 acres, yet the total acreage for identified parcels is approximately 10 acres. Please Confirm the proposed DP area. **Page has been updated to only indicate property areas that are part of this submittal**
-
- 12 Please update the Entitled Building Heights exhibit to include coloration shading to help notate the differences in entitled heights. Additionally, approved building heights that would be useful to see include the existing Southbridge project, Hacienda Hotel and the single-family residential neighborhoods north of Camelback Road. **Additional parcels labeled and coloration depicting existing vs entitled has been added to exhibit on page 65.**
-
- 13 If additional outreach has been conducted since the original submittal, please provide an updated Citizen Involvement Report that includes any key issues that have been identified. **Updated and included with the resubmittal.**
-
- 14 Design observations related to the **Maya Hotel**:
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

14-A The OTSCAP recommends a window/wall ratio around 60/40 (glass to wall). Consider utilizing extended floor plates, functional balconies, solar shade devices, shifts in the horizontal wall plane. Details that project recess and patterns of shade, shadow and sunlight can mitigate the large expanse of glass. Additional articulation of the building walls would also enhance the building design.

Elevations in the Zoning application are conceptual, final designs will be provided within the DR process. The project will be designed to meet glazing requirements per the applicable energy codes. The south, west and east elevations have significantly less glass than the north to respond appropriately to solar exposure. Lower glass at the pedestrian realm is shaded with recesses and projections will be provided in the building massing which create strong shadows. A large solar shade canopy provides shade at the base as well as create a human scale pedestrian zone at the entry and perimeter of the building. The middle of the building will be articulated with shade elements on the west and east facades, functional balconies to create pronounced patterns of light, shadow and color.

14-B Reducing apparent mass is critical. The proposed design has subtle divisions between its base, middle and top. These should be emphasized. The base can be strengthened with a more solid wall, some horizontal detailing and a shade element at the base that turns the corner to the west elevation continuing along the line of the sidewalk, vs. the sidewalk jutting under the building at the porte-cochere. This element would also help to enhance the human scale at the base of the building and reduce the impact of the vertical wall. Also consider increasing or maintaining the intended setback on the south and west sides.

See reponse to 14-A

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 14-C The middle part of the division between the base and the middle should also be emphasized. The middle portion of the building should sit well back from the edge of the base. A 10-foot offset would allow for a roof area that could function as a balcony to provide a nice amenity for the lower level rooms. Wall treatments that mitigate the glass would apply here. [See response to 14-A](#)

-
- 14-D The top part of the building can also be distinguished in some way. Introducing another stepback or recessed area around the top or introducing a horizontal roof element could enhance the appearance. If the roof is programmed, working with the structures on the top of the building could provide some interest however, adequate space would need to be provided so the building stays within the allowed height. [See response to 14-A](#)

-
- 15 Per Section 7.830.B of the Zoning Ordinance, a development proposal that a) includes more than one phase, and b) encompasses greater than two acres (gross) must include a Development Master Plan (DMP). The required components of a DMP are as follows:
- Master Phasing Plan
 - Master Sensitive Design Concepts Plan, including the following:
 - Open Space Plan
 - Landscape and Buffer Plan
 - Master Design Concept Plan
 - Master Drainage Systems Plan
 - Master Transportation Systems Plan
 - Master Water Systems Plan
 - Master Wastewater Systems Plan
 - Master Planned Property Plat
- [Civil has coordinated with staff so that they have the appropriate exhibits. Sheets A111 Phase Plan, A115 Open Space Plan, A116 Pedestrian Circ. Plan, A117 Vehicular Circ. Plan, A118 Refuse Plan have all been added or altered for the submittal to meet staff's request.](#)

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- 15-A For reference the definition of DMP per Article III of the Zoning Ordinance “a detailed plan with multiple infrastructure and design components to provide overall coordination for a complex and often multi-phased zoning district map amendment”. This request encompasses approximately 10 acres in a very urban area, and will be constructed in multiple phases, thus justifying the need for enhanced analysis of impacted infrastructure in and around the project area. Examples of “enhanced analysis” would be, on the Transportation Master Plan, detail where sidewalks are being upgraded/widened and where sidewalks will remain as is; in the infrastructure master plan, waterlines and sewer lines that have been analyzed, and which ones are being upgraded or left as is. Please provide a DMP with the next submittal for staff review. NOTE: The Master Sensitive Design Concepts Plan component is subject to separate approval by the Development Review Board.

[Please refer to response to item #15 and reference sheet A116 for additional pedestrian circulation information on sidewalks.](#)

-
- 16 Please amend the DP to remove “future parcels” from the request. The PBD is a “Planned” district, not a speculative district. If there are no plans for the “future parcels” at this time they should be eliminated and return at a later date as an amendment to the original PBD.

[Future parcels labels have been modified on A111 Phasing Plan to show as a planned Phase 4.](#)

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| 17 | Presently, there are a total of 298 P-3 credits (+/- 89,413 square feet of land area) and 69 physical parking spaces protected by P-2 zoning within the DP area. Additionally, there are three In-Lieu Parking Agreements (1-IP-2011, 2-IP-2014 and 2-IP-2015) within the DP area that appear to still be active. Please update the Parking Master Plan to explain how these credits and spaces are being accounted for. | The P-3 credits will be maintained with the rezoning to Downtown pursuant to Zoning Ordinance Section 6.500. Zoning request has been modified to add P-3 to a portion of the zoning map amendment. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 18 | 18. The case history for the 7301 E. Shoeman Lane parcel indicates that this parcel is/was zoned P-2 and was required to provide parking for the adjacent parcels to the east (7321 & 7323 E. Shoeman Lane). Please confirm this request will not conflict with that requirement. Refer to case 44-ZN-1971. | There is no conflict. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 19 | Please revise the PBD section of the narrative to acknowledge all buildings for this project will be in compliance with the International Green Construction Code (IGCC). Refer to Section 6.1306 of the Zoning Ordinance. | Noted and revised |
| <hr/> | | |
| 20 | Please revise the narrative and applicable plans to acknowledge and identify existing overhead utility and cable lines that will be buried as part of the Development Plan. Refer to Section 47-80 of the Scottsdale Revised Code. | Plans revised to acknowledge existing overhead utility and cable lines. |
| <hr/> | | |

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 21 The provided “Site Cross-Sections” do not sufficiently demonstrate how height and massing for this development (located within 350 feet of the Old Town boundary) transition from adjacent zoning districts to the north of the project sites. With the next submittal, please provide more detailed Transition Plans that include adjacent buildings on the north side of Camelback and distances from those buildings to the project buildings. Refer to Section 6.1304.2.d of the Zoning Ordinance. **Sections on pages 93 and 94 have been revised to show residential context north of Camelback.**
-
- 22 22. The title information and ALTA’s provided cover all but 3 of the parcels indicated as part of this zoning request. The southernmost parcels at the NEC of Wells Fargo and 6th Avenue are not accounted for (confirmed with Survey Department). Please provide a Title Insurance Policy and ALTA Survey for these three parcels. Also please confirm the two parcels at the NEC of Buckboard Trail and Shoeman Lane are now owned by Equity Partners (or related LLC). **Title and ALTA for southernmost parcel included with resubmittal**
-
- 23 Looking through the case folder, staff can find no evidence that “Project Under Consideration” signs were posted prior to the Open House. Please provide with the next submittal. Note: considering the size of the Development Plan area, a minimum of three signs should be posted: one on Scottsdale Road, one on Camelback Road, and one on Stetson Avenue. **Signs will be posted and affidavit will be provided once open house date is set.**
-

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 24 With the next submittal (or prior to), please provide a draft Development Agreement for the proposed special improvements contribution. The agreement should include identification of maintenance responsibility, particularly for the proposed decorative street improvements identified in the Development Plan. **Development Agreement draft is underway and will be submitted shortly after zoning case is resubmitted**
-
- 25 Note: As proposed, abandonment of the alley between Shoeman and Indian Plaza just east of Buckboard Trail will be required. Please be prepared to submit a separate application for abandonment of this alley **Alley abandonment application (Maya alley) is being included with resubmittal**
-
- 26 26. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a minimum 45-foot right of way dedication for Camelback Road. Refer to Section 47-10 of the Scottsdale Revised Code (SRC) and Section 5-3.100 of the DSPM. Modify property line locations accordingly. **Revised.**
-
- 27 27. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a 55-foot right of way dedication for Scottsdale Road. Refer to Section 47-10 of the Scottsdale Revised Code and Section 5-3.100 of the DSPM. **Revised.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 28 | Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a new east-bound deceleration lane at the intersection of Camelback Road and Brown Avenue. This requirement warrants additional right of way dedication along the length of the deceleration lane. | This project is designed to embrace the desire and vision of an urban development that is pedestrian focused. Keeping that in mind, a right turn deceleration lane results in negative impacts to this desired pedestrian environment. |
|----|---|--|
-
- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 29 | The building elevations and perspectives for the City Center portion of the project indicate there will be portions of the building that overhang the pedestrian sidewalks along Scottsdale Road and Camelback Road; however, these overhangs are not indicated on the site sections provided in the DP. Please revise the DP to coordinate the building features shown on the building elevations and perspective and ensure the proposed development standards include these encroachments into the setback and stepback requirements for the site. Refer to Section 1.305.A of the Zoning Ordinance. | Elevations and perspectives are conceptual. Sections are revised to show possible balcony locations. Projections into setbacks and stepbacks will be permitted if in accordance with exception standards outlined in the zoning ordinance section 5.3006.I.2 through 5.3006.I.6 |
|----|---|---|
-
- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 30 | Identify this as an alley. Associated alley width dedications will be a project requirement | Alley exists today - no change proposed. Alley access does not align with alley across the street. |
|----|---|--|
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 31 There are several policies in the Character and Design Chapter of the Old Town Scottsdale Character Area Plan that encourage improvements that “enhance the Old Town pedestrian experience”. Specifically, Policy CD 4.4, which suggests enhancing the Old Town pedestrian experience “through the provision of pedestrian oriented banners, wayfinding, signage and other related infrastructure”, Policy CD 6.5, which encourages the development of “walkable blocks by providing new streets, pedestrian paths.....that connect with other streets and public or common open spaces”, and Policy CD 11.2, which encourages development of “infrastructure improvements that positively impact the aesthetic and mobility aspects of the pedestrian environment”.
With these policies in mind, please consider including a conceptual plan for enhancements/improvements to the existing alley network in the Entertainment District with the next submittal. Recommended improvements include new asphalt, positive drainage enhancements (where needed) and pedestrian scale lighting in the form of pole-mounted fixtures, bollards or building-mounted fixtures. Funds from the Special Improvement contribution, required as part of the PBD and II requests, may be eligible for use toward the completion of these improvements. If this option is selected to help satisfy the Special Improvements requirement, please provide a construction cost estimate for review.
- Sheet A116 Pedestrian Circulation Plan has been modified to indicate sidewalk enhancements and show alleys as connections. Additional language has been added in the landscape design guidelines to address lighting and other design opportunities in alley areas. Refer to DP pages 217 and 225**
-
- 32 Related to Comment #8 above, please revise the site plan, circulation plan and Page 158 (Connection/Pedestrian) of the Development Plan to acknowledge alleyways as secondary pedestrian connections.
- Revised**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 33 The proposed DP does not provide information on how the proposed development will integrate the components of the Scottsdale Road Streetscape Design Guidelines. Please revise the DP to incorporate the components of the Guidelines, including hardscape, patterns, landscaping, lighting, shade structures and Public Art.
- DP has been revised to address an Enhanced Public Perimeter of the project for Camelback and Scottsdale frontages. Refer to pages 187-191**
-
- 34 34. The preliminary Drainage Report has not been accepted by the Storm Water Division. Please revise to address/respond to the following:
- In accordance with the City's DSPM, preliminary Drainage Reports submitted in support of a more conceptual application (i.e. zoning) should include a 50% level of design and analysis, including a preliminary grading & drainage plan for review and evaluation of the major drainage elements relating to the proposed project by City staff. Note: not providing this information will cause a delay in the review and approval of this case. Information missing includes the following:
 - Drainage exhibits for pre- and post-development conditions
 - Calculation of onsite and offsite flows pre- and post-development
 - Storm water storage calculations, pre vs. post-development or first flush (minus true rooftop), whichever is greater
 - Preliminary grading and drainage plan with information on proposed drainage improvements, including storm water storage basins
 - Discussion of any pertinent regional studies, such as the Lower Indian Bend Wash FLO-2D results
- Preliminary Grading and Drainage Exhibits have been incorporated as part of the report illustrating the preliminary design intent. Drainage exhibits for pre and post conditions have been created and incorporated as part of appendix II. Please refer to exhibits 2A:2C and 4A:4C. the sites are not affected by offsite flows as such offsite flows have not been calculated. Onsite flows have been calculated and can be found in Appendix II. Calculations for first flush and pre vs post have been calculated, please refer to section 4.4 of the report. Proposed stormwater infrastructure is discussed in section 4.5 of the report and is called out in the preliminary grading and drainage exhibits. The LIBW Flo-2D demonstrates that there are no offsite flows affecting the proposed developments.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- 35 The preliminary Basis of Design (BOD) reports have not been accepted by the Water Resources Division. Please revise accordingly to address the following comments/requirements: **BOD reports have been revised to address first review comments.**

-
- 35-A • If more than just the proposed Maya Hotel sewer flows are routed south, the requirements of Section 7.830 of the Zoning Ordinance will be triggered, requiring a formal Development Master Plan for the sewer basin. Such a master plan would involve evaluating future growth potential with ultimate build-out conditions and proposing the ultimate infrastructure, or modifications required to accommodate build-out conditions; and how the proposed developments fit into the master plan. **Analysis of the existing infrastructure has been included as part of the revised wastewater BOD. The proposed Maya Hotel sewer flows are proposed to be conveyed south. As such analysis of the existing 12" was performed using the existing peak flow provided by COS for the 12" at 6th avenue and Miller Rd.**

-
- 35-B Confirm sewer routing with survey, field investigation, flow monitoring and analysis. Provide data in report. Refer to Section 7-1.201 of the DSPM. **Sewer routing was confirmed using field survey performed for the Maya Hotel and City Center. Other sewer information was obtained from the COS city QS Maps.**

-
- 35-C Provide preliminary utility plans showing proposed mods/connections for each site. Refer to Section 7-1.201 of the DSPM. **Preliminary utility exhibits were included as part of the revised reports, as well as the sewer profile for the proposed 12" parallel line along Camelback Road.**
-

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- | | | |
|-------|---|--|
| 35-D | Conduct flow monitoring for proposed mods/connections for Maya Hotel routing sewer flows south, or basin analysis based on DSPM loading values. Refer to Section 7-1.201 of the DSPM. | Low monitoring is not feasible at the present time because it will not present accurate data on peak flows due to restaurant closures due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Analysis based on DSPM loading values and prorated factors. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 35-E | Sewer loading needs to be analyzed at the highest estimate proposed demand in order to allow for clear and detailed stipulations to be formulated (should such stipulations be required). If subsequent submittals revise the proposed loading, stipulations can be modified or removed as applicable. Place non-peak information in an appendix for reference. Refer to Section 7-1.201 of the DSPM. | Sewer demands have been revised to analyze the latest site plan and unit count. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 35-F | The existing public sewer, located in an 8-foot Public Utility Easement on the south side of the "City Center" parcel, must remain in place and active; or relocated and existing sewer services reconnected. The western-most parcel to the south of the "City Center" parcel is currently being redeveloped and is connecting to this sewer. As proposed, it appears "City Center" is proposed to be built over the top of this sewer on parcels 173-41-005 and 173-41-004. Refer to Section 7-1.412 of the DSPM. | City Center building will be limited to be outside of the existing PUE to allow the eastern most section of the existing sewer line servicing the southeast parcel to remain in place. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 35-G | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Calculations need to be revised throughout based on coordination and discussion with Water Resources, e.g. existing flows, pool backwash, flow attenuation from other proposed developments. | Calculations have been revised based on coordination meetings and feedback provided by COS. |
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

35-H Move last page of pdf to main body of report.

The report has been bounded to follow the correct format.

35-I • Provide preliminary utility plans showing proposed mods/connections for each site corresponding to the highest peak demand scenario. Refer to Section 6-1.201 of the DSPM.

Preliminary Utility Exhibits have been included as part of the revised reports.

35-J • Water demand needs to be analyzed at the highest estimate proposed demand in order to allow for clear and detailed stipulations to be formulated (should such stipulations be required). If subsequent submittals revise the proposed loading, stipulations can be modified or removed as applicable. Place non-peak information in an appendix for reference. Refer to Section 6-1.201 of the DSPM.

Water demands have been revised to analyze the latest site plan and unit count.

35-K • Provide supply curves corresponding to three hydrant flow tests. Refer to Section 6-1.405 of the DSPM.

Acknowledged

35-L Fire flow needs to be assigned at the minimum for high-rise structures (2,500 GPM). If not a high-rise, evaluate per IFC Appendix and IBC building construction type, and provide determination of fire flow for a structure with sprinklers. Compare with DSPM minimum fire flows and use larger of two values and provide information in report. Refer to Section 6-1.501 of the DSPM.

Fire flow required has been specified to be a minum of 2500 gpm and will be modeled as such in the final report.

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 36 | Please revise all applicable plans to indicate a minimum 10-foot wide sidewalk, separated from back of street curb, along the entire Camelback Road frontage and Scottsdale Road frontage. As an alternative, a minimum 12-foot wide sidewalk attached to street curb may be provided. Refer to Section 5-3.110 of the DSPM, Section 47-36 of the SRC and the 2008 Transportation Master Plan. | Revised and noted on Sheet A116 Pedestrian Circulation Plan |
|----|--|--|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 37 | Please revise all applicable plans to indicate minimum 8-foot wide sidewalks, separated from back of street curb, along all local street frontages. As an alternative a minimum 10-foot wide sidewalk attached to street curb may be provided. Refer to Section 5-3.110 of the DSPM, Section 47-36 of the SRC and the 2008 Transportation Master Plan. | Revised and noted on Sheet A116 Pedestrian Circulation Plan |
|----|--|--|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 38 | Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate minimum 20-foot alleys (10-foot half adjacent to each abutting property). This will require additional right of way dedications in some instances to achieve. Refer to Section 5-3.800 of the DSPM. | Current alley dedication is 8' and will be increased to 10' on our portion of the alley to achieve a combined 20'. |
|----|--|---|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 39 | 39. Minimum driveway spacing for local streets is 165 feet. Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to reconfigure the site driveways to provide more separation and more distance from the Camelback Road curb line. | Site plan for city center is conceptual. Multiple drive entrances are actually conceptual locations for valet services. Driveway closest to camelback has been removed on all plans. |
|----|--|---|
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

40 Please revise all applicable plans to indicate transit shelter improvements (bench, shelter, bike rack and trash can) per Scottsdale standards, or an approved alternative standard, at the existing transit stops on Camelback Road just east of Scottsdale Road and east of Saddlebag Trail. Provide supporting details confirming consistency with Section 5-6.101 of the DSPM and Supplement to MAG Standard Details 2263 and 2264, unless an alternative design is approved (see graphic on following page).

Stockdale would prefer to maintain current bus stop conditions to avert attracting homeless population.

41 The PMP has not been accepted. Please revise to address/respond to the following:

41-A The Shared Parking Table (Table 9.104.A of the Zoning Ordinance) should only be used for a single parcel that has a mix of uses with different hours of operation, not for multiple parcels that are part of an overall DP. Ultimately, this table should not be used for this project, given the history of parking issues in the Entertainment District and the Old Town area as a whole.

The shared parking is applied exclusively to each individual parcel's mixed uses.

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

41-B It appears the study only takes into consideration the three main parcels (A, B and C). Confirm there are no reductions anticipated or requested for the rest of the "future" parcels and/or provide additional analysis for the uses identified for those parcels on Page 77 of the DP (366 units of residential, 105,716 square feet of commercial).

The "future" parcels will provide parking on each of the sites to accommodate the "future" land use.

41-C Staff is not convinced the proposed project and/or adjacent parcels can support 100% of the parking for the Maya Hotel off-site. Please provide additional justification for this and explain why at least some of the parking cannot be provided on-site (podium, sub-grade).

Site is only 90' wide. This would not be large enough for a usual 120' wide below grade structure. Also, access to the below grade would disrupt the pedestrian circulation and add another driveway in addition to service access. Furthermore, shoring for below grade parking adjacent to an occupied building and active streetscape presents logistical challenges.

41-D Related to the comment above, the study proposes all Maya Hotel parking to be located remotely. All hotels, including the Canopy by Hilton (163 spaces) and DC hotel (114 spaces), provide most if not all their required parking on-site in underground parking structures. Some of the parking (during peak hours) appears to be reliant on the Edition Hotel...which hasn't been built yet.

PMP justifies unused existing below grade garage usage directly adjacent to hotel site. Future Edition Hotel parking is not necessary to accommodate the proposed Hotel Maya parking.

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

41-E	Please revise the study to include analysis of the Galleria parking garage, including the overall number of parking spaces in the garage, the number of spaces accounted for by tenants and remote leases, and the number available for public use.	Galleria is not included in this zoning submittal.
41-F	The study identifies ride share as one of the major modes in asking for a parking reduction. The site plan should clearly show appropriate drop-off locations outside the public right of way for drop-off vehicle staging.	Conceptual drop off locations have been added and noted on revised Sheet A117 Vehicular Circulation Plan. Plans are conceptual and will provide drop off sized per need at site plan submittal and DRB stage.
41-G	Though not a requirement of the ordinance, the study should address guest parking for the multi-family residential.	Multi family parking provided will exceed current zoning code requirements and provide sufficient guest parking.
41-H	The study suggests a ratio of 1.1 parking spaces per unit is sufficient for the multi-family residential. The City often receives complaints from neighboring communities about vehicles from multi-family developments proliferating into adjacent streets. A minimum of 1.5 spaces per unit should be provided (2 spaces per unit would be ideal).	No neighborhood streets are adjacent to properties. Multi family parking provided will exceed current zoning code requirements to provide sufficient guest parking.
41-I	The ULI shared parking and ITE requirements cited are too low. They are more appropriate for dense cities with more alternative modes of transportation.	Criteria and rates used in the study were for suburban character.

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

42 The TIMA has not been accepted by Transportation Planning as submitted. Please revise to address/respond to the following: [See below.](#)

42-A Due to heavy east-bounds right turn volumes on Camelback Road at Brown Avenue (119 AM and 94 PM), a deceleration lane is warranted. [This project is designed to embrace the desire and vision of an urban development that is pedestrian focused. Keeping that in mind, a right turn deceleration lane results in negative impacts to this desired pedestrian environment.](#)

42-B Due to poor level-of-service for the northbound left-turn movement at Brown Avenue at Camelback Road, and the proximity of this intersection to Scottsdale Road, left-turn movement should be prohibited. Traffic desiring to head north or west from the site can use Shoeman Lane to Scottsdale Road.....traffic heading south has several alternative routes. [The northbound left turn movement can be maneuvered with gaps created between the adjacent downstream traffic signals particularly during non-peak times. During peak times, there is a network of connecting roadways in this area which provide drivers with optional routes should they choose to avoid this left turn movement. Multi-family users of the Scottsdale Collection development will be familiar with their options and the roadway connections in this area.](#)

42-C The proposed "Driveway B" (#28 in the TIMA) for the City Center should be eliminated as it is too close to the intersection, particularly with the high volume of traffic entering from Camelback Road. [City Center plans are conceptual and will need to address traffic concerns at site plan and DRB stage. Driveway eliminated.](#)

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

42-D Verify items discussed previously and in general transportation and circulation comments. [See response to comments throughout this document.](#)

43 Considering the density and intensity of this area, and the proposed development, staff needs to have a better understanding of how refuse collection is to be accomplished. With the next submittal, please add a more detailed Refuse Control Plan in the DP that includes the following:

- Proposed main route for service vehicles
- Potential standard refuse enclosure locations
- Potential compactor locations

[Plans are conceptual and will meet all city standards with regard to refuse collection at site plan and drb submittal stage. Refuse plan has been broken out and graphics enhanced to better show widths and approach paths along with conceptual refuse locations. Refer to sheet A118 Refuse Plan.](#)

43-A Note that all collection points, approaches, clearances and capacities must be consistent with Section 2-1.309 of the DSPM as follows. [Plans are conceptual and will meet all city standards with regard to refuse collection at site plan and drb submittal stage. Refer to sheet A118 Refuse Plan.](#)

43-B To promote transparency, please ensure Goal, Policy and Guidelines references are correct in the Development Plan. Staff has identified enumeration discrepancies (such as mis-numbering of Old Town Urban Design & Architectural Guidelines). Additionally, please add page numbering to the Development Plan (DP) for reference. [Page numbers added](#)

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 43-C 1. Non-Residential, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family Residential Refuse and Recycling Enclosure Location, Design + Quantity:
Locate and position the enclosure(s) as follows, update site plan accordingly:
- i. Approach pad so that the refuse truck route to and from the public street has a minimum unobstructed vertical clearance of thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches (fourteen 14 feet is recommended), and unobstructed minimum vertical clearance above the approach pad and refuse enclosure of twenty-five (25) feet(The vertical clearances are subject to modification based on enclosure container size, location and positioning as determined by the Sanitation Director, or designee.)
 - ii. In a location that is easily accessible for collection, and does not require the refuse truck to “backtrack”;
 - iii. A maximum 100 feet distance for building service exit to refuse enclosure;
 - iv. So that collection vehicles do not back up more than thirty-five (35) feet;
 - or,
 - v. So that path of travel for the refuse truck accommodates a minimum vehicle of turning radius of 45 feet, and vehicle length of 40 feet.
- a. Design the refuse enclosure(s) and approach pad to be level, with a maximum of a two (2) percent slope.
Do not place the enclosure(s):

Plans are conceptual and will meet all city standards with regard to refuse collection at site plan and DRB submittal stage. Refer to sheet A118 Refuse Plan.

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 43-D 2. Required Number of Non-Residential, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family Residential Refuse and Recycling Enclosures quantities as follows. Update site plan accordingly:
1. Non-Residential, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family Residential developments shall provide the 1 commercial refuse enclosure per every 20 residential/hotel/condo units or 20,000 square feet of office/retail. Each site/restaurant shall have its own refuse enclosure + each restaurant shall provide a grease containment area in refuse enclosure in accordance with the city's standard detail. Non-Residential, Mixed-Use, and Multi-Family Residential developments are encouraged to incorporate recycling of reusable refuse material with in the design of a building
- D. Compactors may be used as an alternative to refuse or recycling containers. To determine adequacy + site location of compactors, if proposed, please provide the following on a refuse plan, compactor: a. Type b. Capacity - State on site plan compactor capacity conversion equating to the city's required 1 enclosure for every 20 units with no recycling or 2 enclosures for every 30 units with recycling. Although recycling is not a requirement, it has been determined to be an amenity city residents are looking for in this type of development. c. Location
- i. For both horizontal + vertical compactors: Place the refuse compactor container and approach pad so that the refuse truck route to and from the public street has a minimum unobstructed vertical clearance of thirteen (13) feet six (6) inches (fourteen 14 feet is recommended), and unobstructed minimum vertical clearance above the concrete approach slab and refuse compactor container storage
- Plans are conceptual and will meet all city standards with regard to refuse collection at site plan and drb submittal stage. Refer to sheet A118 Refuse Plan.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 44 The DP proposes greatly reduced setbacks along Camelback Road from the standard setback of 40 feet to as little as 20 feet from the curb line. Most properties along Camelback Road in this area provide at least a 25-foot setback from the curb line. Additionally, when reviewed in tandem with the height of the proposed building(s), the proposed setback of 20 feet would place the building(s) in a position to the street that would appear much closer than other buildings with a similar setback but a lower building height (height to street width). Please revise the DP to provide an increased setback along Camelback Road. Refer to the Old Town Urban Design and Architectural Guidelines (OTUDAG).
- Per meetings with City Staff - 20 ft. matches the W hotel and is an increase from current conditions. Enhanced Public Perimeter guidelines have been added to the design guidelines on pages 187-191 and outline the building setback of 20-ft. with designation of no outdoor dining to block pedestrian pathway.**
-
- 45 The DP proposes to revise the typical stepback requirement from the Old Town boundary at the Mint portion of the site. This revision significantly encroaches into the typical stepback requirement. Please revise the DP to reduce the proposed encroachment into a standard requirement to reduce potential impacts on other properties in the area. Refer to DC Hotel site for an example of a less impactful stepback. Refer to the OTUDAG.
- Current setback and stepback needs to be maintained for parking floor plate dimensions. Elevated open space requirement has been added to parcel guidelines on page 92. This requirement along with Enhance Public Perimeter guidelines on pages 187-191 will help ensure massing along Camelback Road is stepped back and broken up.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 46 46. The DP proposes significant modifications to the typical stepback at the Maya Hotel site, particularly at the south side of the building along Shoeman Lane where the building is located at the setback line with no stepback. This aspect of the proposal differs significantly from the guidelines included in the OTUDAG. Please revise the building design for the Maya Hotel to provide additional building stepbacks.
- The proposed modifications to the Stepbacks are due to the location of the small site within the center of the entertainment district. The small site internal to the overall district combined with a Hotel's functional requirements of stacked room types & MEP chase alignments limit upper level step-backs which may be more applicable in other locations or uses within the district. However, per OTUDAG guidelines 13 and 14, the hotel will provide a clear base-middle and top separation in wall plane to reduce the apparent size and mass. The separation will be provided by recesses and projections which create shadows helping to divide the building into smaller components. A large solar shade defines the base as well as create a human scale pedestrian zone at the entry and perimeter of the building. The middle of the building will feature shade elements on the west and east facades, functional balconies to create pronounced patterns of light, shadow and color. The top will feature an articulated roofscape which enhances the building and the overall Old Town skyline from a distance.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 47 The design for the Maya Hotel utilizes a significant amount of glazing. Sensitive Design Principle 9 encourage desert-appropriate responses to materials and building design. Please revise the building design to reduce the amount of glazing on the east, south and west-facing elevations and incorporate more shading of glazing on those elevations.
- Elevations in the Zoning application are conceptual, final designs will be provided within the DR process. The project will be designed to meet glazing requirements per the applicable energy codes. The south, west and east elevations have significantly less glass than the north to respond appropriately to solar exposure. Lower glass at the pedestrian realm is shaded with recesses and projections will be provided in the building massing which create strong shadows. A large solar shade canopy provides shade at the base as well as create a human scale pedestrian zone at the entry and perimeter of the building. The middle of the building will be articulated with shade elements on the west and east facades, functional balconies to create pronounced patterns of light, shadow and color. .**
-
- 48 Please strengthen the Lighting section of the DP (Page 192 of 216) to include a master location plan, examples of potential fixture types and supporting graphics. Speak to how impacts from lighting are to be mitigated, specifically at the Old Town boundary (Camelback Road), i.e. limiting height of fixtures, strategic use of lighting for signage and building accent lighting, etc. Refer to Table 7.820.A (Special Impacts Analysis) of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Refer to new DP pages 225-226 for existing and proposed lighting locations and description of fixture typologies.**
-

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 49 Please note: All Public Art elements will require approval from the Scottsdale Cultural Council for the art itself and DRB approval for the location of the art. Per Section 7.1010 of the Zoning Ordinance, note the following: With the first Development Review application, the applicant shall: 1. Include an approved Conceptual Art Plan that includes the artwork and locations; or
2. Propose, in the application narrative:
a. A methodology and timeframe to obtain an approved Conceptual Art Plan and submit a separate Development Review application for the artwork location before the first building permit application for the development; and
b. An in-lieu payment to be made with the first building permit issuance for the development
- Suggested art locations and typologies are indicated on the new Conceptual Art and Community Open Space location plans on pages 81, 91, and 100.**
-
- 50 Please note: some of the signage options represented in the DP, such as standing canopy signs, an increase in allowed sign area, and heights that are shown on the perspectives cannot be achieved, or can only be achieved as part of a Community Sign District. Refer to Section 8.302 of the Zoning Ordinance for more information.
- Proposed signage options are outlined in the DP page 178**
-

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- | | | |
|-------|--|---|
| 51 | Due to the high left-turn volume, proximity to the Scottsdale Road intersection and reasonable alternative access (Shoeman Lane to Scottsdale Road), please restrict the northbound left-turn lane movement at Camelback Road and Brown Avenue. | The northbound left turn movement can be maneuvered with gaps created between the adjacent downstream traffic signals particularly during non-peak times. During peak times, there is a network of connecting roadways in this area which provide drivers with optional routes should they choose to avoid this left turn movement. Multi-family users of the Scottsdale Collection development will be familiar with their options and the roadway connections in this area. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 52 | Please provide a recommendation to improve pedestrian movement across Scottsdale Road between Camelback Road and Shoeman Lane. The circulation plan indicates a pedestrian facility directing traffic to a midblock location. | Site plan and Pedestrian Circulation Plans revised to show additional Scottsdale Road pedestrian crossing at south side of Shoeman Lane. |
| <hr/> | | |
| 53 | The proposed redesign of the Shoeman Lane/Buckboard Trail intersection will not be supported as shown on the “Illustrative Maya Hotel Plan”. This design creates right of way issues and confusing driving lanes for drivers. Note: the intersection is shown correctly on the “Site Circulation and Refuse Plan”. | Intent for intersection is as shown on Site Plan submittal sheets. |
-

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

- 54 The proposed “enhanced Intersection” paving material and design must be approved by the Public Works Director prior to any future Development Review Board approval. Crosswalks associated with these enhanced designs must be located near the curb returns, consistent with national standards, and be approved by the Transportation Director. Same applies to the proposed “Enhanced Pedestrian Walk”. **Acknowledged.**
-
- 55 Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to indicate a curbed separation for the valet drop-off proposed on Buckboard Trail adjacent to the hotel. Details for the proposed design shall be submitted with the Development Review Board application for the hotel. **Design of valet to comply with City requirements at site plan and DRB submittal stage.**
-
- 56 Please revise the site plan and circulation plan to identify the extent of the proposed public alley near the intersection of Saddlebag Trail and Indian Plaza. A Public Access Easement will be required for any portion of this connection that is not dedicated as public right of way. **Plans revised.**
-
- 57 57. Please note the following for future Development Review Board applications:
-

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

-
- 57-A An updated TIMA will need to be submitted for review and approval with the first DRB application due to incomplete traffic volume data contained in the TIMA provided with the zoning case. This will be a stipulation for the zoning case. **Understood.**
-
- 57-B All site plans must identify service areas for service vehicle parking and guest drop-off/pick-up areas located outside the public right of way. **Revised and shown on sheets A117 and A118.**
-
- 57-C All multi-family site plans shall identify staging areas for service vehicle parking and moving truck loading/unloading areas located outside public right of way. **Revised and shown on sheets A117 and A118.**
-
- 57-D Streetlighting will need to be enhanced in the vicinity of these developments. Provide conceptual street lighting plans. **See new pages 225 and 226 of DP.**
-
- 58 Please note: Any alley connection to a street will need to be reconstructed to provide an accessible pedestrian connection. Refer to Section 3-1.701 of the DSPM. **Noted.**
-
- 59 Please note: Construction work in the alleys will need to be coordinated with Solid Waste to avoid any disruptions in service. Refer to Section 5-2.616 of the DSPM. **Acknowledged.**
-

The Scottsdale Collection

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

60 Please note: The proposed Entry feature over Saddlebag Trail at Camelback Road will require a license agreement. Also refer to Signage comment (#50) in "Considerations". **Acknowledged.**

60-A Please resubmit the revised application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A, Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for further review. The City will then review the revisions to determine if the application is to be scheduled for a hearing date, or if additional modifications, corrections, or information is necessary. **Acknowledged with resubmittal.**

60-B The Planning & Development Services Division has had this application in review for 22 Staff Review Days since the application was determined to be administratively complete.

60-C These 1st Review Comments are valid for a period of 180 days from the date on this letter. The Zoning Administrator may consider an application withdrawn if a revised submittal has not been received within 180 days of the date of this letter (Section 1.305. of the Zoning Ordinance).

60-D within 180 days of the date of this letter (Section 1.305. of the Zoning Ordinance).
If you have any questions, or need further assistance please contact me at 480-312-4306 or at gbloemberg@ScottsdaleAZ.gov.

The Scottsdale Collection

August 10 2020

Applicant Responses

9-ZN-2020 and 1-II-2020